DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 392 IR 053 848

AUTHOR Dimmick, Judith A.
TITLE The Status of Faculty Status in Ohio Academic Libraries, 1990.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 48p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; *Academic Rank (Professional); Administrator Attitudes; Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; Librarian Attitudes; *Librarians; Professional Development; Salaries; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire survey sent to 75 of the 134 Ohio academic library directors elicited 59 respondents in a study of faculty status for academic librarians. Results show that only 42% of libraries assign librarians faculty rank, even though 61% of directors favor it, and 64% think librarians themselves favor it. Some Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) standards for faculty status have wider acceptance than others: leave, 85%, financial support for professional activities, 83%; faculty senate membership, 69%; access to grievance and appeal procedures, 69%; self-governance, 49%; peer review for promotion, 47%; eligibility for tenure, 37%; equivalent salaries, 31%; and academic year contracts, 22%. One likely source of defining librarian roles and closely aligning their contributions with those of other faculty would be interrelated library and parent institution mission statements. But libraries that have inter-related mission statements, are no more likely to grant faculty status (41%) than those that do not have them. (Copies of the survey cover letter, questionnaire, and a summary of the questionnaire responses are appended.) (33 references) (Author/MAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED339392

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE STATUS OF FACULTY STATUS IN OHIO ACADEMIC LIBRARIES 1990

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Judith A. Dimmick

July, 1991

IR053848

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Judith A. Dimmick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Master's Research Paper by

Judith A. Dimmick

B.A., Indiana University, 1966

M.A., Indiana University, 1968

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1991

Approved by

Adviser Lars Batttan Date 1-19-91

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire survey sent to seventy-five of the 134 Ohio academic library directors elicited fifty-nine respondents in a study of faculty status for academic librarians. Results show that only 42% of libraries assign librarians faculty rank, even though 61% of directors favor it, and 64% think librarians themselves favor it. Some ACRL standards for faculty status have wider acceptance than others: leave, 85%, and financial support for professional activities, 83%; faculty senate membership, 69%; access to grievance and appeal procedures, 69%; self governance, 49%; peer review for promotion, 47%; elibibility for tenure, 37%; equivalent salaries, 31%; and academic year contracts, 22%. One likely source of defining librarian roles and closely aligning their contributions with those of other faculty would be interrelated library and parent institution mission statements. But libraries who have interrelated mission statements are no more likely to grant faculty status (41%) than those who do not have them.

1205384

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	iv
Acknowledgments	v
I. Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	5
Objectives	5
Definition of Terms	5
Limitations	7
II. Review of the Literature	9
III. Methodology	18
IV. Findings and Discussion	20
V. Summary and Conclusions	27
Appendix A: Cover Letter	30
Appendix B: Questionnaire	33
Appendix C: Summary of Questionnaire Responses	35
References	39

List of Tables

		Page
Table I.	Number and Percent of Total Responding Libraries with Faculty Benefits and Responsibilities	20
Table II.	Number of Academic Libraries with Teaching Librarians	21
Table III.	Progress of Faculty Status Standards in Ohio since 1979	23
Table IV.	Opinions and Degree of Controversy about Faculty Status	24
Table V.	Libraries with Mission Statements Related to Institutional Mission by Number Assigning Faculty Rank	25
Table VI.	Percentage of Libraries with both Interconnected Mission Statements and Faculty Titles for Academic Librarians	26

Acknowledgements

A number of people, in addition to questionnaire respondents, have contributed immeasurably to this study. Many thanks to Dr. Lois Buttlar for guidance and patience in seeing this project through. Heartfelt thanks to Janet Beatty, LaRita Eadie, Peter Kleinhenz, and Roger Kaminski, without whose encouragement and advice this study would not have been completed. Thanks also to Dr. John Dimmick for helping to design the study.

Dedicated

to

Jennifer Dimmick

I. INTRODUCTION

The question of whether or not academic librarians should have employment status equal to academic teaching staff is far from settled, even though the issue has had more than two decades of intense debate. A strong professional movement in the late 1960s and 70s toward nationwide attainment of faculty status for all academic librarians resulted in an official Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) mandate, published in 1971:

> . . . college and university librarians must be recognized as equal partners in the academic enterprise, and they must be extended the rights and privileges which are not only commensurate with their contributions, but are necessary if they are to carry out their responsibilities. (Association of College and Research Libraries 1974, 112.)

ACRL adopted nine standards for attaining faculty status and in 1973 reinforced these with a formal model and procedures for implementation which were revised in 1987 (Association of College and Research Libraries 1987). Nevertheless, in spite of these official sanctions, and in spite of promises by ACRL to monitor the situation and promote compliance, studies reported in library literature over the past 20 years show that:

(1) Faculty status for librarians has been attained in only about one-third of colleges and universities; figures vary, depending on the study and its study group, but see, for example, the survey of academic status conducted by the ACRL

in 1981 (Association of College and Research Libraries 1981, 171).

(2) In the other two-thirds, only a few of the standards have been attained.

Janet Krompart and Clara DeFelice's "survey of surveys" (1981, 15) found that participation in university governance was the most often achieved standard; the least achieved has been the academic year contract (usually nine months), as opposed to a twelve-month contract.

The issue is still hotly debated and ranks are divided, not only among faculty and administrators but also among librarians themselves. At the heart of the unresolved conflict is role ambiguity created by academic librarians' position at an "intersection of multiple worlds," as Robert P. Holley puts it; academic librarians face an "identity crisis" because:

> At various times and to various degrees, they can see themselves as faculty engaged in teaching and research, as helping professionals with clients to serve, or as managers with a business to run (Holley 1988, 117).

The distinction of faculty status seems dubious to many librarians because performing the teaching and/or research functions of faculty, in addition to important library-specific service functions, is too often obstructed by lack of release time, clerical assistance, financial support, and cooperation and support among peers (Jenkins, Cook, and Fox 1981).

On the other hand, a look at the history behind the struggle, fought particularly hard twenty years ago, is a reminder that the fight for status is a fight for professional autonomy. As early as 1926, an American Library Association (ALA) survey showed that more than 80% of reporting libraries were controlled by faculty, not by library directors and their staff. Another issue is respect for the intellectual contributions of academic librarians. In the past, librarians were hired for their technical skills only, and were perceived as clerks, a perception that the profession fights yet today (Shiflett 1983, 261). But many academic librarians argue that their intellectual contributions are equal to those of teaching faculty because they create a value-added learning environment to the traditional classroom environment. Diane Parker (1989, 676), for example, writes that only librarians provide access to the diversity of intellectual materials needed for students' autonomous pursuit of their own academic freedom.

The current reality seems to be that the issue is decided at the individual institution level, rather than by the academic library profession. One possible basis for deciding the issue, if it is to be decided by each individual college or university and not by the profession as a whole, is the mission of the college or university itself. For instance, if one of the main goals of the institution is to contribute published research to further the knowledge of the broader academic community, then academic librarians should be prepared to participate and to define their role in this mission; to be coequals with teaching staff who publish research, academic librarians would also contribute published research. Or if the

primary mission of the college or university is to provide upgraded vocational training to better the employment opportunities of its students, then both librarians and teaching staff need to contribute expertise in teaching students about, for instance, job markets.

Some writers have addressed the issue of placing academic librarians in the larger world of higher education in general rather than the smaller world of a single library. Rebecca Kellogg (1988, 606), for instance, discusses the possibility of emancipating academic librarians from the confines of the library walls; status will follow actions that merit it, she says, when academic librarians "take on the larger, more fundamental, and infinitely more important question of how the unique knowledge of academic librarians should be identified and used by the institution in support of institutional missions, concerns, and needs" (Kellogg 1988, 606).

Barbara B. Moran (1989, 34) too, concedes that there may be "no one 'ideal' status for academic librarians and . . . the appropriate status [may] be best worked out on an institution-specific basis." She looks ahead to the possibility of decentralized library units "where a 'holistic' librarian with an advanced subject degree and knowledge of the research process works in close relationship with faculty and students in a specific discipline or field of study"; in such a 'library,' "the faculty status model might fit very well." But the potential of using the mission of an individual college or university as a basis for deciding the issue of faculty status for academic librarians, although suggested in the literature, has not been studied.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the status of faculty status for academic librarians in Ohio and the relationship of mission statements of both the library and the academic institution to this status.

Objectives

The following research questions are addressed by this questionnaire study:

(1) Do Ohio academic librarians at a specific college or university have the same status as the teaching staff in terms of professional responsibilities and benefits?

(2) Is there a relationship between the status of academic librarians (see Appendix A, question #1a) and the presence or absence of connected formal mission statements of (a) the library and (b) the library's parent institution (see Appendix A, question #12, part 2)?

Definition of Terms

Faculty status is "official recognition of [academic] librarians as part of the instructional and research staff by conferring on them faculty ranks, titles, benefits, privileges, rights and responsibilities" (ALA Glossary 1983, 90).

Academic status, on the other hand, is "official recognition of librarians as part of the instructional and research staff but without

faculty ranks and titles, and often without benefits, privileges, rights, and responsibilities (ALA Glossary 1983, 1).

Briefly summarized, these are the nine criteria first established by ACRL in 1973 for the attainment of **faculty**, as opposed to **academic**, status; academic librarians should be equal with teaching faculty in the following rights and responsibilities:

(1) Professional responsibilities and self determination, including autonomy in fulfilling responsibilities and rigorous review by peers.

(2) Library governance similar to departmental governance.

(3) Participation in the academic senate.

(4) Compensation, with an academic-year contract or an adjusted salary scale.

(5) Tenure, with pre-tenure contracts.

(6) Promotion, with a peer review system and with faculty ranks and steps

(7) Sabbatical and other research leaves under the same provisions.

(8) Equal access to research funds.

(9) Academic freedom.

The 1987 revision (ACRL 1987) consists of the same standards but augmented by detailed minimal criteria for their implementation, specifically for equality with teaching faculty in:

(1) Appointment

(2) Promotion in academic rank

(3) Tenure (i.e., continuous appointment)

(4) Termination of appointments

(5) Grievance procedures

(6) Dismissal procedures

(7) Action (right to review of dismissal) by governing board

(8) Procedures for imposing other sanctions

(9) Terminal salary or notice

(10) Academic freedom and protection against discrimination

(11) Complaints of violations of (10) in non-reappointment

(12) Rights of administrative personnel as faculty members

(13) Freedom to engage in political activities

Limitations

The biggest obstacle to any study of faculty status is the lack of comprehensive statistics. Many questionnaire-based studies have been done, but most are centered on a geographical area or on a particular kind of academic library. There is no overall nationwide picture available. This study, too, is a necessarily limited in its focus on a sample of Ohio academic library directors. Any conclusions to be drawn from the study, therefore, may not apply universally.

Another limitation of this study is that responses to the questionnaire were solicited only from academic library directors rather than from all academic librarians because of time and expense constraints, and because an adequate and inexpensive source for identifying the entire population of Ohio academic librarians was not available. Library directors' perceptions may vary from those of librarians. In fact, in one survey-based study, library directors' perceptions that librarians actually have the specific benefits

prescribed by the ACRL Standards exceed those of the librarians themselves for each faculty benefit but one--peer review for tenure (Davidson, Thorson, and Stine 1983, 419).

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Where do academic librarians fit into the overall university or college structure? Do they provide, as do counselors and clinicians, academic support services only, or are they faculty co-equals providing primary teaching and research, as well as traditional library skills? In literature on the issue of faculty status for librarians, the opinion seems to be shifting from the all-or-nothing "faculty co-equals" of the 1960s and 70s to a more accommodating view.

Even those institutions which had granted faculty status have begun to reconsider. For example, Gloriana St. Clair and Irene Hoadley (1988) send out a "call to militancy" for gaining faculty status and for keeping it from being "eroded and diluted." They report their library's fight at Texas A&M to retain faculty status in opposition to administrators who were planning to rescind it. In another example, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), acting as collective bargaining agent for the Montgomery College faculty in Maryland, filed suit in 1988 against the college, "contending that college officials stripped three librarians of their (non-tenured) faculty status without due process (AAUP 1988, 5). And Thomas English (1983, 205), surveying ARL libraries on the issue, found that the 1960s and 70s trend to grant faculty status has halted among research libraries in the 80s; in fact, both the University of Utah and the University of Houston have reversed the

status of their librarians from faculty to nonfaculty. In the former case, the academic senate made the decision; in the latter, the proposal was initiated, at least, by the librarians themselves, when an excellent reference librarian was fired because of failure to meet other standards of faculty work performance.

ACRL itself has had to modify, at least for now, its blanket advocacy of faculty status for all academic librarians. In July 1987, the ACRL Academic Status Committee sponsored new statements to be added to the written standards for faculty status. One is a formal opposition to recent moves by some states to certify all librarians (College and Research Library News 1988, 305). State certification would take the M.L.S.-granting, credentializing powers away from library schools, thereby de-autonomizing the profession. The other is composed of a new set of "Guidelines for **Academic** Status . . . ," as opposed to **faculty** status, intended for the guidance and protection of those who do not have faculty status. The ACRL Committee has made a series of ambiguous statements on this issue. On the one hand, the Committee proclaimed "faculty rank and status as the appropriate designation for librarians"; but having "wrestled with the issue . . . [for] several years," the Committee states that "the current standard is not appropriate for many colleges and universities" (Ibid, 306). Does this ambivalence weaken the position of academic librarianship as a whole, or does it represent a reluctant but realistic assessment that the academic library community responds by individual institution to the divergent missions of parent colleges and universities?

Whether justified or misguided, the professional ideal of faculty status for all academic librarians is still an unresolved issue. Yet it is an issue that affects profoundly the way academic librarians perform their jobs by establishing the criteria by which they will feel successful or not and by which they will be judged as successful or unsuccessful. The issue also has ramifications for the curricula of the library schools which train the profession. If academic librarians will become faculty responsible for original research and publication and for teaching, perhaps, in the classroom in addition to bibliographic instruction in the library, as students, they will need to learn more of these skills in M.L.S.-granting graduate schools.

Meanwhile, debate on many of the professional issues underlying the issue of faculty status continues. Here are some samples of the crossfire of opposing opinions as expressed in library literature:

1. Are academic librarians teachers?

   Pro: Barbara I. Dewey and J. Louise Malcomb assert that the "librarian-teacher model is necessary and successful" (1988, 147).

   Con: Pauline Wilson (1979, 153) says the idea is a harmful organizational fiction.

2. If they are teachers, what should they teach and how much?

   Pro: Dewey and Malcomb (Ibid, 1936) report on the Evergreen State College structure where librarians hold joint appointments with the faculty and the library; librarians teach courses, and the faculty work in the library.

Con: Fred Batt (1985, 120), on the other hand, asserts that while reference work and bibliographic instruction involve teaching, librarians do not convey a body of content-based information in a specific field as do other faculty departments.

3. Do academic librarians engage in research?

Pro: Where there is a concerted effort to study the conditions needed for librarians to produce and publish research, and then to provide those conditions conducive to successful scholarship, the literature reports, academic librarians are turning out scholarly, research-based publications. Darrell L. Jenkins, M. Kathleen Cook, and Mary Anne Fox (1981) describe efforts at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, and Susan L. Miller and others (1976) describe developing an Advisory Committee on Research at The Ohio State University Libraries. In a study of both librarian and faculty approaches to publishing original work, Robert Boise, Jordan M. Scepanski, and Wayne Wilson (1987, 502) find that the two professions have "similar styles of coping with new pressures for scholarly writing" and that he, the observer in the study, "a traditional faculty member who has studied his colleagues for two decades, learned that librarians are as bright, intellectual, scholarly, and competent as their faculty counterparts"[!]

Con: And yet by contrast, Jane Robbins (1989, 5) reports "quite troublesome" conclusions about the very limited success of a structured continuing education program, developed jointly by the library school and the library system at the

University of Madison-Wisconsin, and designed to produce "research librarians."

4. Should research librarians publish only in the library and information science field?

Pro: Purdue University librarians decided "yes," if library and information science is to be considered a true academic discipline. However, the decision created a controversy. Which topics should be included and which should be excluded from the field? Is this decision fair to librarians who hold degrees in other subject specialties? The resolution at Purdue University Library left the interpretation of what belonged to the field to the tenure and promotions committee, with the proviso that the discipline be broadly interpreted and that publications in other scholarly fields receive secondary consideration (Geahigan and others 1981, 572-573).

Con: But most academic libraries do not limit research to library and information science; for example, Patricia M. Wallace (1986) reports that the issue is unresolved at the University of Northern Colorado where development of a university-wide performance evaluation document is forcing teaching-faculty/librarian comparisons. Librarians who had published bibliographies or had done research for writing a historical novel, for instance, realized that these pursuits might be questionable accomplishments in the face of an evaluation document that calls for publication "in the discipline" (289).

5. Does the M.L.S., sanctioned as the 'terminal' professional degree, sufficiently prepare research librarians?

Pro: The answer is "yes" by default, since there is no evidence in the literature that library schools are expanding their curriculum requirements beyond a one-year-regimen master degree. One study based on a 1979 survey found that: "Most of the tenured librarians in large university libraries have a bachelor's or master's degree in library science" (Smith and others 1984, 93).

Con: Having conducted a part-time educational program to teach research skills to practicing research librarians, Robbins (1989, 5) feels strongly that twelve credits in addition to the one-year M.L.S. program would be required for academic librarians to publish research successfully; furthermore, in order for librarians to be able to contribute new knowledge through the practice of research, she is convinced, a Ph.D. or teaming with someone who holds a Ph.D., is necessary to be firmly grounded in empirical study and analysis.

Survey studies of the issue of faculty status for academic librarians are piecemeal, inconclusive, and sometimes conflicting because no comprehensive data are available. The ACRL "Academic Status Survey" of 1981 solicited "printed information regarding academic status" at the participant's institution and included in the unpublished report copies of a wide range of documents sent by thirty-one respondents (of the 100 queried), but made no attempt to analyze these or use them thereafter.

This 1981 study surveyed 140 libraries, equally divided into university, four-year college, and two-year college libraries, none of which belong to the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Results

from the 126 responding libraries (a 90% return rate) showed that only 44% claim to have full faculty rank, status, and privileges for their librarians, and well over half of these (72%) are two-year college libraries. By comparison only 30% of ARL member libraries had full faculty status for librarians, with university libraries having 34% and four-year colleges 26%. The least achieved faculty attributes were lack of an academic year contract, tenure, and equal salaries.

These results differ from the results of another questionnaire-based study, conducted by English (1982). Besides finding a dead halt in the movement to grant academic librarians faculty status, as previously mentioned, his tally showed that of the total eighty-nine ARL libraries queried, 61.4% of state institutions, but only 18.7% of private schools, had granted librarians full faculty status. Unsurprisingly, those with full faculty status were more likely to have traditional faculty benefits and privileges. "Extensive disagreement on the status issue" cropped up among the Big Ten schools; only Illinois, Minnesota, Ohio State, and Purdue grant faculty status. It is this study which an ACRL Academic Status Committee task force is in the process of replicating and expanding to include college and community college librarians (Association of College and Research Libraries 1989, 677). Perhaps this expanded study will provide a clearer overall picture of the status of faculty status than is now available.

A further study by English again surveyed the eighty-nine ARL members, but the questions were directed to nonlibrary administrators in the schools' offices of academic affairs. The forty-

seven responses (a return rate of 52.8%) showed that administrators believed (1) that "no substantive advantages to an institution" have been established for granting librarians faculty status (1984, 189), and (2) that librarians are unsuited for meeting "the traditional faculty requirements for tenure--demonstrated effectiveness in teaching and research" (Ibid. 192).

Of the many other questionnaire-based studies of this issue, all disparate in focus, population surveyed, and results, one other should be summarized here: Greg Byerly's survey conducted in June 1979, "The Faculty Status of Academic Librarians in Ohio" (1980). Of the fifty-five Ohio colleges and universities "that offer at least a B.A.," forty-five (82%) responded. Although twenty-five of these gave librarians faculty titles, only eleven met all nine ACRL Standards; the only rights achieved in more than half of the faculty-status-granting institutions were membership in the faculty senate and on faculty committees and eligibility for sabbaticals and research funds. Librarians at large public graduate institutions were more likely to be granted the actual benefits of faculty status, whether they held faculty titles or not, than librarians at small private schools.

Taken altogether, survey results have generally shown gradually slowing or no progress toward attaining the goal of faculty status for all academic librarians. These studies have also revealed the unsolved professional dilemmas at the heart of the faculty status issue.

Is it possible to solve all of these dilemmas universally? The ideal that all academic librarians should be full-fledged faculty members may be unrealistic; if so, this may account for the fact that

the broad issue remains unresolved after so many years of struggle, advocacy, resistance, and ambiguity by librarians themselves. Whether or not academic librarians have or want faculty status should depend on whether or not faculty status enhances or restricts professional growth and the ability to perform on the job.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study is designed as a questionnaire-based survey of Ohio academic library directors on the issue of faculty status for academic librarians. A disproportional stratified random sample of the total population of 134 Ohio academic libraries was chosen from the Directory of Ohio Libraries (The State Library of Ohio 1990, 48-55), and a three-page questionnaire was sent to directors of these selected libraries. To make the selection, libraries were first divided into four groups by size, based on total volumes held as reported in the Directory (Ibid).

The rationale for grouping the population by size was to control for differences in approach to the issue of faculty status that may be caused by institutional size; larger colleges and universities are often more committed to scholarly research than smaller institutions which may serve a more limited function (e.g., a seminary committed to training clergy, or a technical college focused on training mostly local students for vocations).

On the assumption that the twelve largest Ohio college and university libraries would be academic leaders more likely to belong to collegiate research-based networks and to have a strong commitment to scholarly research, questionnaires were sent to library directors of all twelve. In order to have a total sample size of at least half of the total census of Ohio academic libraries, twenty-one of each of the remaining three groups were chosen by assigning

numbers within each group and choosing a random sample with the use of a "Random Numbers" table (Powell 1985, 73):

Group (1)--500,000+ vols.---------- N = 12 libraries
Group (2)--100,000 to 499,999 vols.-- N = 38 libraries
Group (3)--50,000 to 99,999 vols.----- N = 29 libraries
Group (4)--1 to 49,999 volumes------- N = 55 libraries
TOTAL = 134 libraries

A three-page questionnaire (see Appendix A) of nineteen fixed-response questions, some with multi-parts, was constructed and mailed to a total of seventy-five (over half of all) Ohio academic library directors. Also included in the mailing was a cover letter (see Appendix B), a self-addressed, stamped envelope, and, as encouragement to respond, a free bookplate. Since the questionnaire was designed to be easy and fast to fill out, the cover letter requested a return by two weeks from the date of mailing.

Response rate was good; fifty-nine of seventy-five questionnaires were filled out and returned, a 78.7% return rate:

10 of 12 in Group (1)
16 of 21 in Group (2)
18 of 21 in Group (3)
15 of 21 in Group (4)

Responses were entered, tallied, and compared with the use of a Foxpro software program created by LaRita Eadie.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Forty (68%) responding libraries have a formal classification ranking for librarians, but only twenty-five (42%) assign librarians faculty titles. Thus, only about two-fifths of Ohio academic librarians hold faculty status.

Table I shows the number and percentage of libraries whose staff librarians have specific benefits and responsibilities equal to teaching faculty.

Table I. Number and Percent of Total Responding Libraries with Faculty Benefits and Responsibilities

Benefit/Responsibility	No.	%
Faculty titles	25	42
Tenure eligibility	22	37
o Teaching required	01	02
o Publishing required	13	22
Academic year	13	22
Self governance	29	49
Academic senate members	41	69
Equal salaries	18	31
Peer review for promotion/tenure	28	47
Leave for professional activities	50	85
Equal grievance and appeal procedures	41	69
Financial support for professional activities	49	83

Only four of the nine ACRL standards are met by more than 50% of the respondents:

Leave for professional activities	86%
Financial support for professional activities	75%
Academic governing body members	69%
Equal grievance and appeal procedures	69%

The most often achieved faculty attribute is equal leave for professional activities; the least often is the requirement to teach, followed equally by the requirement to publish and academic year contracts. Less than one-fourth of these libraries accord librarians an academic year contract; fewer than one-third give pay equal to classroom faculty.

Although not required to teach, many librarians do in various ways as indicated in Table II:

Table II. Number of Academic Libraries with Teaching Librarians.

Libraries with Librarians Who Teach:	No.	%
Library school classes	07	
Formal nonlibrary classes in other depts.	25	42
Formal classes on library topics	37	63
Informal nonclassroom teaching	41	69
Reference/technical-services-as-teaching	33	54
Other	04	07

The four "other" responses include three directors who mention bibliographic instruction and one who notes that several librarians teach academic courses, although they are not required to do so.

Books, refereed journal articles, professional conference papers, and bibliographies are the most acceptable forms of publications for the twelve libraries whose librarians are required to publish for tenure and promotion. Only four libraries also require publications to be research-based, and two restrict the subject of publications to the library/information science field. See Appendix C for a summary table of all responses by responding library directors.

Roughly compared to the results of Byerly's study in 1979 of faculty status of Ohio academic librarians (his study divided colleges and universities by type of ownership rather than by size), these results show that the goal of universal faculty status for academic librarians in this state has suffered a setback. In Byerly's study, 55.5% of the 45 responding Ohio college and university libraries (from a total of 55) granted librarians faculty titles, contrasted to this study which finds only 42% with faculty status.

Progress toward attaining some of the ACRL standards is evident from comparing results of this study with Byerly's, but other standards have lost ground., as shown in Table III. Peer review, self governance, academic year contracts, and leave for professional activities have all increased substantially even though, overall, fewer than half of institutions grant them. But faculty senate participation, equal salaries, eligibility for tenure, and financial support for professional activities are rights and responsibilities currently granted less often.

Table III. Progress of Faculty Status Standards in Ohio since 1979

	CURRENT STUDY (1990)	BYERLY STUDY (1979)
PROGRESS:		
Peer review	47%	23%
Self governance	36%	49%
Academic year contracts	02%	22%
Leave for professional activities	56%	85%
SETBACKS:		
Faculty senate members	69%	73%
Salaries	31%	46%
Tenure eligibility	37%	48%
Finances for professional activities	83%	100%

More library directors and librarians favor faculty status for academic librarians than who actually have it, but the issue is not widely controversial, as shown in Table IV.

Table IV. Opinions about Faculty Status and Degree of Controversy on the Issue

	Yes		No		N/A*
	N	%	N	%	N
Favorable:					
Directors	36	61%	19	32%	04
Librarians (from directors' view)	38	64%	12	20%	09
Controversial Issue:					
Among librarians	08	14%	48	81%	03
Between librarians and other university staff	11	19%	48	81%	00

*N/A = Not applicable or no answer.

Only 42% of librarians have faculty titles, but 61% to 64% favor faculty status, whether they currently have it or not. In 14% to 19% of institutions, the issue is controversial, slightly more so in the wider individual university or college environment than among librarians themselves.

In order to assess the possible impact of a library mission statement which specifically refers to an overall institutional mission statement, this study compared the affirmative responses to the question asking if the library's mission statement referred to the mission of the parent institution (see Appendix A, question #12, part 2) with the "yes" answers to the question ascertaining the presence or absence of faculty rank (Appendix A, question #1a). In other words, of those libraries which have interconnected mission

statements, how many also have faculty titles for librarians? Table V gives the comparison of numbers and percentages of affirmative responses for each group and for all respondents.

Table V. Libraries with Mission Statements Related to Institutional Mission by Number Assigning Faculty Rank.

Library by Size	With Mission Statement		Also With Faculty Rank		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Group 1	9	90.00	5	55.55	10	50.00
Group 2	7	45.00	1	14.29	16	06.25
Group 3	8	44.44	2	25.00	18	11.11
Group 4	8	53.33	5	62.50	15	33.33
Total	32	54.24	13	40.63	59	22.03

Only 22% of all responding libraries which have interconnected mission statements also assign faculty status for librarians. For all groups, thirty-two libraries have interconnected mission statements. Only thirteen of these libraries (41%) also have faculty titles for staff librarians. This response might indicate that interconnected mission statements have little impact on the attainment of faculty titles for librarians. Certainly, results are inconclusive. However, it is worth pointing out that, as shown in Table V, for groups one and four, more than half of those libraries with interconnected statements also have

faculty titles, while for groups two and three, one-fourth or less have corresponding "yes" answers to both questions.

Table VI. Percentage of Libraries with both Interconnected Mission Statements and Faculty Titles for Academic Librarians

Group 1	--	56%
Group 2	--	14%
Group 3	--	25%
Group 4	--	63%
TOTAL	--	41%

It would take further study to determine whether these differences among institutions grouped by size, based on volumes held, are significant. A possible explanation could be that the largest and smallest of the institutions have more clear-cut missions and therefore more ease in aligning contributions of librarians with those of faculty. However, this study does not provide enough information to suggest reasons for these differences.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Results of this study of Ohio academic libraries indicate that the universal professional goal of achieving faculty status has lost ground in Ohio. This setback is evident from comparing results of Byerly's 1979 study, which found that 55.5% of responding library directors and their staff held faculty status (1980, 423), with results of the current study which shows that only 42% of directors responding and their staff librarians have faculty status.

The many facets of the issue are unresolved. Some of the nine ACRL standards have gained ground in Ohio and some have lost ground since 1979. Several standards for achieving equality between librarians and teaching faculty are met by more than half of libraries: leave and financial support for professional activities, faculty senate membership, and access to grievance and appeal procedures. Self governance and peer review for promotion and tenure are granted in almost half of libraries surveyed. Other standards lag far behind: eligibility for tenure, academic year contracts, and equivalent salaries are accorded in fewer than one-third of Ohio academic libraries.

Three-fifths of directors themselves favor faculty status, while two others feel that their librarians favor faculty status, contrasted to the slightly more than two-fifths (42%) of libraries who actually have it. The issue is considered to be controversial in less than one-fifth of libraries/institutions.

Neither do the results of this study evidence a significant relationship between those libraries which have mission statements interrelated with overall institution mission statements and also grant faculty titles, although many more of the largest and smallest institutions have both interrelated mission statements and faculty status for librarians than do middle-sized institutions.

Opinions and convictions on the issue of faculty status for academic librarians run the gamut from Arthur M. McAnally's (1971, 5) mandate that: "Librarians must either join the faculty or be permanently relegated to peripheral and inferior roles" to John DePew's (1983, 407) conviction that academic librarians should "divest themselves of the albatross of faculty status" so that they may achieve "their true goal: the provision of useful information on a timely basis to meet the needs of users of academic libraries."

As long as the academic library profession remains ambiguous, with part of the profession pro, part con, and part undecided, the issue needs to be studied and written about. Silence amounts to abdication. If the profession doesn't clarify and settle the issue, other, nonlibrary, professionals will decide for them.

Continuing studies of faculty status by the ACRL Academic Status Committee are a good indication that the profession will continue to evaluate all aspects of the issue and to monitor the realities of the academic library work world. A recent draft revision of the ACRL standards reaffirms the right of faculty status for academic librarians:

> Because of the value added to the academic endeavor, college and university librarians are equal partners with other faculty in the academic experience of students and faculty. A true partnership based on equal contributions translates to equivalent rights and privileges for all faculty members. (Association of College and Research Libraries 1990, 403.)

Faculty status for academic librarians is an important issue to the profession because whether or not academic librarians hold faculty status affects profoundly how they do their jobs and what contributions they are able to make to their colleges and universities. Although librarians at individual colleges and universities could formally define their roles by means of library mission statements specifically related to parent institutions' missions, they do not presently do so.

APPENDIX A:

QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY OF FACULTY STATUS IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

This study is intended to define the benefits and responsibilities accorded to Ohio academic librarians, in order to determine whether they have full faculty status or not. Please answer the following questions about your library staff and add any comments you wish to make.

1. Does your library have a formal classification ranking for librarians? _____Yes _____No

   If no, go to question #2.

   If yes, what is the ranking based on? (Choose one.)

   _____a. Faculty titles
   _____b. Non-faculty titles determined by parent institution
   _____c. Non-faculty titles determined by library
   _____d. Other. Please explain:_____

2. Are librarians promoted on the same criteria as teaching faculty? _____Yes _____No

3. Are librarians eligible for tenure using the same criteria as teaching faculty? _____Yes _____No

4. Are librarians required to teach to achieve tenure or promotion? _____Yes _____No

5. Do librarians teach any of the following? (Mark as many as apply.)

   _____Library school classes
   _____Formal classes in departments other than the library
   _____Formal classes on library topics
   _____Informal non-classroom instruction
   _____Reference-work/technical-services-as-teaching
   _____Other. Please explain:_____

(Please go to page 2)

6. Are librarians required to publish scholarly research in order to be either tenured or promoted?
_____Yes _____No

If no, go to question #7.

If yes, which kinds of publications are acceptable? (Mark as many as apply.)

_____a. Books or chapters in books
_____b. Refereed journal articles
_____c. Unrefereed journal articles
_____d. Professional conference papers
_____e. Published bibliographies
_____f. In-house publications, university-wide
_____g. In-house publications, library-wide
_____h. Other. Please list kinds:_____
_____
_____i. Reviews

7. Are publications required to be research-based?
_____Yes _____No

8. Are acceptable publications restricted to those in the library/information science field?
_____Yes _____No

9. Do full-time librarians work a prescribed schedule of 40 hours/week? _____Yes _____No

If no, go to question #10.

If yes, and if published research is required for promotion or tenure, is release time provided from daily duties for pursuing research and writing? _____Yes _____No

10. Which of the following responsibilities or benefits are the same for both teaching faculty and librarians? (Mark as many as apply.)

_____Contract lengths the same as for teaching faculty
_____Participation in a library-governing body
_____Participation in an institutional governing body
_____Salaries equal to teaching faculty
_____Recommendation by peer review for tenure/promotion
_____Leave time for participation in professional organizations, conferences, and committees
_____Access to the same grievance and appeal procedures as teaching faculty
_____Access to financial support for extracurricular professional activities

(Please go to page 3)

11. Does your college or university have a written mission statement? _____Yes _____No

If no, go to question #12.

If yes, is publishing scholarly research required of teaching staff in the statement? _____Yes _____No

12. Does your library have a written mission statement?
_____Yes _____No

If no, go to question #13.

If yes, does this mission statement make specific reference to an overall mission statement of your college or university?
_____Yes _____No

13. Do you as Director (or other designated Head) favor full faculty status for librarians at your college or university?
_____Yes _____No

14. Do your library professionals on staff favor full faculty status, whether they currently hold it or not?
_____Yes _____No

15. Is full faculty status for librarians a controversial issue among your library staff? _____Yes _____No

16. Is full faculty status for librarians an issue of disagreement between library staff and other university staff?
_____Yes _____No

17. How many of each of the following are on your library staff? (Mark as many as are applicable.)

_____FTE professionals
_____FTE paraprofessionals
_____Part-time professionals
_____Part-time paraprofessionals
_____Paid student assistants

18. Approximately how many volumes/items are in your library collection? _____

19. Is your school a member of:
_____ACRL _____ARL _____Other alliance

(End--thank you!)

APPENDIX B:

COVER LETTER

School of Library Science
(216) 672-2782

Kent State University
Kent, Ohio 44242-0001

October 8, 1990

Dear Director:

As a graduate student in Kent State University's M.L.S. program, I am conducting a survey of academic library Directors (or other designated Head) in Ohio on the issue of faculty status for academic librarians. Your prompt and voluntary response to the enclosed questionnaire is important and essential to my study. Could you please volunteer some time to fill out your answers, as quickly as possible, and return the questionnaire in the enclosed S.A.S.E. no later than Monday, October23, 1990.

Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. The research paper that I am writing from an analysis of the results of this questionnaire will not name any specific libraries or colleges or universities or individuals. I would be happy to send you a copy of the finished study, if you will note on your questionnaire that you are interested.

To thank you for your anticipated response, I have also enclosed a bookplate to use in one of your favorite books.

I look forward to receiving your questionnaire. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Judy Dominick

7724 Scofield Ct.
Dublin, OH 43017
614-792-8544 (H) 614-291-4656 (W)

Encs: Three-page questionnaire, S.A.S.E., bookplate

APPENDIX C:

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Total Questionnaire Responses
(N = 59)

Question:	Yes N	Yes %	No N	No %	N/A
1. Formal ranking (N = 41)	41	68%	17	29%	01
a. Faculty titles	25				
b. Non-faculty/set by institution	09				
c. Non-faculty/set by library	06				
d. Other ["Appointed by administration"]	01				
2. Faculty promotion criteria	25	42%	32	54%	02
3. Tenure eligibility	22	37%	35	60%	02
4. Required to teach	01	02%	57	97%	01
5. Librarians teach:					
a. Library school classes	04				
b. Formal nonlibrary classes	25				
c. Formal classes on library topics	37				
d. Informal instruction	41				
e. Ref-work/tech-services-as-teaching	33				
f Other ["Bibliographic instruction"]	04				
6. Required to publish	13	22%	46	78%	00
a. Books or book chapters	12				
b. Refereed journal articles	12				
c. Unrefereed journal articles	08				
d. Conference papers	11				
e. Published bibliographies	11				
f. University-wide publications	05				
g. Library-wide publications	05				
h. Other	00				
i. Reviews	08				
7. Publications required to be research-based	04	07%	40	68%	05
8. Publications in library field only	02	03%	43	73%	03
9. Forty-hour work week (N = 46)	46	78%	13	22%	00
9. part 2. Release time provided	09	20%	09	20%	28
10. Faculty benefits and responsibilities					
a. Academic contract year	13				
b. Library governance	29				
c. Faculty senate members	41				
d. Salaries	18				
e. Peer review	28				
f. Leave time for professional activities	50				

g. Grievance and appeal procedures	41				
h. Financial support for professional activities	49				
11. Overall institutional mission statement (N = 56)	56	95%	03	05%	00
11. Part 2. Requires published research	10	18%	30	54%	16
12. Library mission statement (N = 38)	38	64%	20	34%	01
12. Part 2. Reference to overall mission	32	84%	04	11%	02
13. Director in favor of faculty status	36	61%	19	32%	04
14. Librarians in favor of faculty status	38	64%	12	20%	09
15. Controversy among librarians	08	14%	48	81%	03
16. Controversy between librarians & faculty/admin	11	19%	48	81%	00

REFERENCE LIST

AAUP sues Montgomery College over librarians' rank. 1988. American Libraries 19 (January): 5.

The ALA glossary of library and information science. 1983. Heartsill Young, ed. Chicago: American Library Association.

Association of College and Research Librarians. 1990. ACRL standards for faculty status for college and university librarians: A draft revision. College and Research Libraries News 51 (May): 402-404.

_____. 1989. Librarian status study. College and Research Libraries News 50 (September): 677.

_____. 1988. Hearings on academic status and certification. College and Research Libraries News 49 (May): 305-307.

_____. 1987. Model statement of criteria and procedures for appointment, promotion in academic rank, and tenure for college and university librarians. College and Research Libraries News 48 (May): 247-254.

_____. 1981. Academic status survey [Summary/Report]. College and Research Libraries News 42 (June): 171.

_____. 1981. Academic status survey [Full-text Report]. [Chicago: American Library Association], photocopy.

_____. 1974. Standards for faculty status for college and university librarians. College and Research Libraries News 34 (May): 112.

Batt, Fred. 1985. Faculty status for academic librarians: justified or just a farce? In Issues in academic librarianship: Views and case studies for the 1980s and 1990s: 115-128.

Boice, Robert, Jordan M. Scepanski, and Wayne Wilson. 1987. Librarians and faculty members: coping with pressures to publish. College and Research Libraries 48 (November): 494-503.

Byerly, Greg. 1980. The faculty status of academic librarians in Ohio. College and Research Libraries 41 (September): 422-429.

Davidson, Russ, Connie Capers Thorson, and Diane Stine. 1983. Faculty status for librarians: querying the troops. College and Research Libraries 44 (November): 414-420.

DePew, John N. 1983. The ACRL standards for faculty status: panacea or placebo. College and Research Libraries 44 (November): 407-413.

Dewey, Barbara I. and J. Louise Malsomb. 1988. Librarians as teachers: a study of compensation and status issues. In Advances in library administration and organization: a research annual, Vol. 7. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press. 135-148.

English, Thomas. 1984. Administrator's views of library personnel status. College and Research Libraries 45 (May): 189-195.

_____. 1983. Librarian status in the eighty-nine U.S. academic institutions of the Association of Research Libraries. College and Research Libraries 44 (May): 571-575.

Geahigan, Priscilla, Harriet Nelson, Stewart Saunders, and Lawrence Woods. 1981. College and Research Libraries 42 (November): 571-575.

Holley, Robert P. 1988. Academic librarianship, intersection of multiple worlds. Journal of Library Administration 9: 111-117.

Jenkins, Darrell L., M. Kathleen Cook, and Mary Anne Fox. 1981. Research development of academic librarians: one university's approach. The Journal of Academic Librarianship 7 (May): 83-86.

Kellogg, Rebecca. 1987. Faculty members and academic librarians: distinctive differences. College and Research Libraries News 48 (November): 602-606.

Krompart, Janet and Clara DiFelice. 1987. A review of faculty status survey, 1971-1984. The Journal of Academic Librarianship 13 (March): 14-18.

McAnally, Arthur M. 1975. Status of the university librarian in the academic community. In Faculty status for academic librarians: A history and policy statements. Chicago: American Library Association: 1-30.

Miller, Susan L., Irene B. Hoadley, Kaye Gapen, and Rosario Poli. 1976. To be or not to be: an academic library research committee. The Journal of Academic Librarianship 2 (March): 20-24.

Moran, Barbara B. 1989. The unintended revolution in academic libraries: 1939 to 1989 and beyond. College and Research Libraries 50 (January): 25-27.

Parker, Diane C. 1989. Librarians: an element of diversity within the faculty. College and Research Libraries News 50 (September): 675-676.

Powell, Ronald R. 1985. Basic research methods for librarians. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing.

Robbins, Jane. 1989. Research skills for research librarians: a report on and examples from an educational program. The Journal of Academic Librarianship 15 (March): 4-6.

Shiflett, Orvin Lee. 1981. Origins of Academic Librarianship. Norword, N.J.: Ablex Publishing.

Smith, Karen F., Tamara U. Frost, Amy Lyons, and Mary Reichel. 1984. Tenured librarians in large university libraries. College and Research Libraries 45 (March): 91-98.

St. Clair, Gloriana and Irene Hoadley. 1988. The challenge to faculty status: a call to militancy. Wilson Library Bulletin 63 (December): 23-26.

Wallace, Patricia M. 1986. Performance evaluation: the use of a single instrument for university librarians and teaching faculty. The Journal of Academic Librarianship 12 (November): 284-290.

Wilson, Pauline. 1979. Librarians as teachers: the study of an organization fiction. Library Quarterly 49 (April): 146-162.